



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/928,272 09/12/97 ISKRA

M P-3818

EXAMINER

QM31/0421

RICHARD J RODRICK
BECTON DICKINSON AND COMPANY
1 BECTON DRIVE
FRANKLIN LAKES NJ 07417-1880

CHO, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3762

DATE MAILED:

04/21/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks



Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTY. DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

5

DATE MAILED:

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/8/99
- ☒ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) 10-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☒ The proposed drawing correction, filed on 2/8/99 is ☒ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES--

Art Unit: 3762

Election/Restriction

1. Claims 10-18 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected claims. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 3.

This application contains claims 10-18 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 3. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Drawings

2. The corrected or substitute drawings were received on 2/8/99. These drawings are approved for entry.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griffin '4,335,730 in view of Burns '5,458,854.

Art Unit: 3762

Griffin discloses a collector assembly and specimen tube comprising a first open end 20 and a second closed end 18, wherein the closed end is reinforced by a reservoir tip of reduced diameter so that the tube is adapted for the precipitation of a measured quantity materials. Accordingly, the closed end of Griffin reads on applicant's "second end being configured into at least a partially arcuate shape." However, Griffin does not disclose the partition member.

Burns teaches a collection assembly useful for collecting small quantities of blood, wherein the closed bottom end 38 represents a partition member, see figure 1. In regards to claim 2, see figure 1; element 47. In regards to claim 4, the closed bottom end 38 clearly is integral with the housing sidewall 22. With respect to claim 7 and 8, see column 5, lines 43-49. With respect to claim 9, it is observed that applicant's specification does not disclose that the dimensions solves any particular problem or produces any unexpected result and therefore such is merely a matter of engineering design choice, and thus does not serve to patentably distinguish over the prior art. Moreover, the second end being open or closed is also considered a matter of engineering design choice, see particularly applicant's claim language, which provides that the second end may or may not be closed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the invention of Griffin with the partition member as taught by Burns in order to reduce the volume in the housing.

Art Unit: 3762

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 2/8/99 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that "Griffin is silent in teaching a solid partition within the housing", the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would be one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Griffin with a partition member.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure,

Art Unit: 3762

such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In response to applicant's argument that *Burns* teaches against rounded end, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 3762

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to David J. Cho, whose telephone number is (703) 308-0073. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, John Weiss, can be reached on (703) 308-2702. The fax number for this Group is (703) 305-3590 or x3591.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

dj cho



Patent Examiner
April 18, 1999


RONALD STRIGHT
PRIMARY EXAMINER